

REMARKS

Claims 59-61, 67 and 76-101 are pending. By this Amendment, claim 101 is added, claims 59, 61, 67, 76, 79, 81, 83, 85-87 and 90-99 are amended, and claims 51-58, 62-66 and 68-75 are cancelled. Applicant reserves the right to file one or more divisional applications to pursue the cancelled (previously withdrawn), non-elected claims 51-56, 62-66, 68, 69 and 71-75. The independent claims are amended to more clearly distinguish over the applied references. Various ones of the dependent claims are amended for clarity and to be consistent with the amended independent claims. In addition, dependent claim 85 is amended to overcome the objection to that claim noted on page 2 of the Office Action.

Applicant notes with appreciation the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 85. Applicant submits that all pending claims are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons set forth below.

Claims 57, 59, 67, 70, 76, 83 and 84 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) over U.S. Patent No. 6,008,885 to Takahashi et al. This rejection is moot with respect to cancelled claims 57 and 70. This rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to the remaining claims.

In particular, Takahashi et al. does not disclose or suggest the feature of a mask blind disposed in a boundary portion of the first and second illumination systems as recited in independent claims 59 and 67. The feature is supported in the specification at, for example, Fig. 20(a) and page 95, lines 12-16. In Takahashi et al., the fly eye lens 39 is disposed in an incidence plane of the second illumination system (i.e., near a boundary portion between the first and second illumination systems). A masking blade is included in the illumination system 31. See, for example, col. 4, lines 17-20 of Takahashi et al. Accordingly, independent claims 59 and 67, as well as their dependent claims, are patentable over Takahashi et al.

Claims 58, 60 and 61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takahashi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,137,349 to Taniguchi et al. This rejection is moot with respect to cancelled claim 58, and is respectfully traversed with respect to claims 60 and 61.

Taniguchi et al. does not provide the deficiencies of Takahashi et al. with respect to independent claim 59, from which claims 60 and 61 depend. Accordingly, claims 60 and 61 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claim 59.

Claims 77-82, 86-89, 91-92 and 94-98 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takahashi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,574,537 to Ozawa. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Ozawa does not provide the deficiencies in Takahashi et al. discussed above with respect to independent claims 59 and 67. Accordingly, claims 77-82 and 86 are patentable for at least all of the reasons set forth above with respect to independent claims 59 and 67.

With respect to independent claims 87 and 97, neither Takahashi et al. nor Ozawa, individually or combined, discloses or suggests, *inter alia*, the claimed feature that all of the movable optical members of the illumination system are disposed independent of the first support member. This claimed structure does not generate vibrations for the first support member. As mentioned above, col. 4, lines 17-20 of Takahashi et al. indicates that the masking blade is located in illumination system 31, which is mounted to the barrel base 9, which holds the projection optical system 2. See Figs. 1 and 3 of Takahashi et al. Accordingly, independent claims 87 and 97, as well as their dependent claims, are patentable over Takahashi et al. and Ozawa.

Regarding independent claim 92, neither Takahashi et al. nor Ozawa discloses or suggests the claimed movable mask blind which is disposed in an emitting plane of the first illumination system, and which enables changes to the illumination range of the mask by the exposure beam, and a fixed mask blind which is disposed in an incidence plane of the second

illumination system, and which fixes the illumination range of the mask by the exposure beam. Accordingly, independent claim 92, as well as its dependent claims, are patentable over Ozawa et al. and Takahashi et al.

Claims 93, 99 and 100 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takahashi et al. in view of Ozawa, and further in view of Taniguchi et al. Because Taniguchi et al. does not provide the deficiencies of Takahashi et al. and Ozawa discussed above with respect to independent claims 92 and 97, claims 93, 99 and 100 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 92 and 97, respectively.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicant's undersigned attorney at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario A. Costantino
Registration No. 33,565

MAC/ccs

Attachment:

Petition for Extension of Time

Date: June 12, 2003

OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC
P.O. Box 19928
Alexandria, Virginia 22320
Telephone: (703) 836-6400

**DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE
AUTHORIZATION**

Please grant any extension
necessary for entry;

Charge any fee due to our
Deposit Account No. 15-0461